Postal Regulatory Commission
Submitted 10/4/2017 12:56:05 PM
Filing ID: 101991
Accepted 10/4/2017

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

Before Commissioners: Robert G. Taub, Chairman;
Mark Acton, Vice Chairman;
Tony Hammond; and
Nanci E. Langley

Date Enhancement and
Reporting Requirements for Flats

Docket No. RM2018-1

COMMISSION INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1

(Issued October 4, 2017)

To better understand data reporting systems that provide information pertaining to flats and to determine if these data reporting systems can estimate cost and service impacts, the Postal Service is requested to provide written responses to the following questions. Answers to the questions should be provided within 60 days from the date of this Request.

Pinch Point 1: Bundle Processing

1. Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports

a. Please confirm that the following data systems are inputs to Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports: PostalOne!, Surface Visibility (SV), Informed Visibility (IV), Business Intelligence Data Store (BIDS), and Electronic Mail Improvement Reporting (eMIR).[1] Please list any additional inputs to

[1] *See* Docket No. ACR2015, Response of the United States Postal Service to Commission Information Request No. 1, November 28, 2016, at 34, 38 (Response to CIR No. 1).

Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports. If not confirmed, please provide all inputs to the Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports.

b. Please confirm that the Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports report bundle breakage volumes for Standard Mail and Periodicals by month, by facility, by machine type, by mail service provider, and/or by mail owner. *See id.* at 34-35. If not confirmed, please explain how the reports account for bundle breakage volumes. Please list any additional capabilities of the Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports.

c. Please confirm that the Postal Service uses Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports to gain insight into root causes of bundle breakage, to identify overarching impacts of bundle breakage on service, and to investigate top opportunity facilities, locations, and machines in an effort to develop strategies to address bundle breakage. *See id.* at 36. If confirmed, please explain the strategies developed by the Postal Service and industry stakeholders to address bundle breakage. Please provide any additional uses and/or outputs of Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports.

d. Please provide the quarterly Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, the following data should be included in the report:

   i. Number of bundles processed;

   ii. Number of bundles processed by class;

   iii. Number of broken bundles;

   iv. Number of broken bundles by class;

   v. Number of bundles processed by machine type;

   vi. Number of bundles broken by machine type;

   vii. Percent of Total Bundle Count (*see id.*);

   viii. Percent of Contribution of Total Broken Bundles (*see id.*); and

ix. A list of all output data reported in Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports.

e. Please explain how improvements to eMIR that address at-risk mail will impact Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports.[2] Please explain when eMIR improvements will occur.

f. Please provide a date as to when the bundle breakage dashboard will be complete. *See* Response to CIR No. 1 at 34.

g. Please explain if there are any other planned improvements to Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports and when those improvements will occur.

h. Please explain if other improvements could be made to Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports that are not currently planned.

i. Please explain how Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports can be used to measure the impact of bundle breakage on flats costs.

j. Please identify any additional costs associated with bundle breakage. *See id.* at 41.

k. Please explain how Bundle Breakage Visibility Reports can be used to measure the impact of bundle breakage on flats service.

2. Service Performance Diagnostic (SPD) Reports

a. Please confirm that the following data systems are inputs to SPD Reports: BIDS, and Seamless Acceptance and Service Performance System (SASP) (SASP Inputs: PostalOne!, SV, Facility Access and Shipment Tracking system (FAST), and scan data). *See id.* at 25-26. Please list any additional inputs to SPD Reports. If not confirmed, please provide all inputs to SPD Reports.

[2] *See* Docket No. ACR2015, Third Response of the United States Postal Service to Commission Requests for Additional Information in the FY 2015 Annual Compliance Determination, Report Regarding Information about Flats Data Systems, July 26, 2016, at 30-32 (120-Day Response); *see also* Response to CIR No. 1 at 41-43.

b. Please confirm that SPD Reports access data from systems to generate reports that can be used to help diagnose service issues. *See id.* at 26. Please explain any additional outputs and/or capabilities of SPD Reports.

c. Please explain any uses of SPD Reports, including data collection. *See id.*

d. Please provide the quarterly SPD Reports from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, the following data should be included in the report:

   i. Work in Process (WIP) cycle time reports, including:

      (a) Median elapsed time from entry to bundle scan

      (b) Median elapsed time from entry to piece scan

   ii. WIP report showing median hours between actual entry time and the APPS/APBS bundle scan for mail entered at:

      (a) DSCF entry discount

      (b) Origin entry

      (c) ADC entry

      (d) NDC entry

   iii. WIP metric that shows median time elapsed from actual entry time to initial automation piece level scan

   iv. Actual number of pallets unloaded compared to mailer reported pallets

e. Please explain how improvements to SV will impact SPD Reports and when those improvements will occur. *See* 120-Day Response at 24-25. In addition, please explain what other improvements could be made to SPD Reports that are not currently planned.

f. Please explain how SPD Reports can be used to measure the impact of bundle breakage on flats costs.

g. Please explain how SPD Reports can be used to measure the impact of bundle breakage on flats service.

3. Bundle Visibility Reports

a. Please confirm that scan data from carrier route bundles at mail processing plants and delivery units are the only inputs to Bundle Visibility Reports. *See* Response to CIR No. 1 at 27. Please list any additional inputs. If not confirmed, please provide all inputs to Bundle Visibility Reports.

b. Please confirm Bundle Visibility Reports leverage scan data to report primarily on scanning compliance to ensure that the data available are complete enough to provide analytic value. *See id.* Please explain any additional capabilities of the data system.

c. Please confirm Bundle Visibility Reports can track where carrier route bundles are actually located in the process, from acceptance to final processing at delivery units. *See id.* In addition, please discuss all uses and/or outputs from Bundle Visibility Reports.

d. Please provide quarterly Bundle Visibility Reports from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, the reports should include:

i. Average and median time it takes a carrier route bundle to travel from acceptance to final processing at delivery unit.

ii. Information that demonstrates examples when:

(a) Induction delays caused by a communication failure during shift change;

(b) Induction delays caused by missing placards;

(c) Induction delays caused by placards reflecting incorrect time and date of receipt; and

(d) Induction delays caused by placards reflecting target day for clearing.

e. Please explain how improvements to SV will impact the Bundle Visibility Program and when these improvements will occur. *See* 120-Day Response at 24-25.

f. Please explain if there are any other planned improvements to the Bundle Visibility Program and when those improvements will occur.

g. Please explain what other improvements could be made to the Bundle Visibility Program that are not currently planned.

h. Please explain how the Bundle Visibility Program can be used to measure the impact of delays in bundle processing on flats costs.

i. Please explain how the Bundle Visibility Program can be used to measure the impact of delays in bundle processing on flats service.

Pinch Point 2: Low Productivity on Automated Equipment

1. Mail Processing Variance Reports

a. Please confirm that the following data systems are inputs to the Mail Processing Variance Reports: eFlash, Web-based Complement Information System (WebCOINS), Web Management Operating Data Systems (WebMODS), Time and Attendance Collection System (TACS), and Web End of Run (WebEOR). *See id.* at 35. Please list any additional inputs. If not confirmed, please list all inputs to Mail Processing Variance Reports.

b. Please confirm that the Mail Processing Variance Reports provide past complement, workhour, productivity, and workload analysis by facility, down to operational activity within each Labor Distribution Code. *See id.* Please explain any additional capabilities of the data system.

c. Please confirm that the Mail Processing Variance Reports: (1) calculate actual versus earned performance against standardized target productivity

expectations and trends performance from national results to the unit level; and (2) utilize integrated data to identify workhour savings opportunities in a relevant and actionable performance management platform. *See* Response to CIR No. 1 at 46-47. Please provide any additional uses and/or outputs form Mail Processing Variance Reports.

d. Please provide quarterly Mail Processing Variance Reports from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, these reports should include:

   i. Workload by machine type;

   ii. Workhours by machine type;

   iii. Productivity by machine type;

   iv. "Actual" versus "earned" workhour performance by machine type (*see id.* at 46); and

   v. "Percent achievement" and "variance to target" by machine type (*see id.* at 47).

e. Please explain any planned improvements to Mail Processing Variance Reports and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain what other improvements could be made to Mail Processing Variance Reports that are not currently planned.

g. Please explain how Mail Processing Variance Reports can be used to measure the impact of low productivity on automated equipment on flats costs.

h. Please explain how Mail Processing Variance Reports can be used to measure the impact of low productivity on automated equipment on flats service.

2. Machine Chart Run vs. Plan Reports

a. Please confirm that WebEOR is the only input to Machine Chart Run vs. Plan Reports. *See* 120-Day Response at 38. If not confirmed, please list all inputs to Machine Chart Run vs. Plan Reports.

b. Please list all capabilities of the Machine Chart Run vs. Plan Reports.

c. Please list all uses and/or outputs from the Machine Chart Run vs. Plan Reports.

d. Please provide national, quarterly Machine Chart Run vs. Plan Reports from FY 2013 to present.

e. Please explain any planned improvements to the Machine Chart Run vs. Plan Reports and when those improvements will take place.

f. Please explain what other improvements could be made to the Machine Chart Run vs. Plan Reports that are not currently planned.

g. Please explain how the Machine Chart Run vs. Plan Reports can be used to measure the impact of low productivity on automated equipment on flats costs.

h. Please explain how the Machine Chart Run vs. Plan Reports can be used to measure the impact of low productivity on automated equipment on flats service.

3. Mail History Tracking System (MHTS)

a. Please list all inputs to the Mail History Tracking System. *See id.* at 35.

b. Please confirm that the MHTS is an online software application that allows Postal Service employees to identify improperly sequenced mail before carriers take it to the street. *See id.* at 39. Please explain any additional capabilities of the data system.

c. Please confirm that the MHTS provides data at the facility level and some data at the individual mailpiece level can be used to identify mail that is being worked incorrectly on a destination sort plan and mail that is being worked at the wrong facility. *See id.* Please list any additional uses and/or outputs from MHTS.

d. Please provide quarterly reports from MHTS from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, the following data should be included in the report:

i. Average cycle times of mail within a facility;

ii. Average cycle times of mail between facilities; and

iii. Average cycle times of unassigned mail.

e. Please explain any planned improvements to MHTS and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain what other improvements could be made to MHTS that are not currently planned.

g. Please explain how MHTS can be used to measure the impact of low productivity on automated equipment on flats costs.

h. Please explain how MHTS can be used to measure the impact of low productivity on automated equipment on flats service.

4. Single-Piece First-Class Mail Root Cause Reports

a. Please confirm that the Transit-Time Measurement System (TTMS) is the only input to Single-Piece First-Class Mail Root Cause Reports. *See id.* at 40. If not confirmed, please list all inputs to the Single-Piece First-Class Mail Root Cause Reports.

b. Please explain all capabilities of the Single-Piece First-Class Mail Root Cause Reports.

c. Please explain all uses and/or outputs of the Single-Piece First-Class Mail Root Cause Reports.

d. Please provide national, quarterly Single-Piece First-Class Mail Root Cause Reports from FY 2013 to present.

e. Please explain any planned improvements to the Single-Piece First-Class Mail Root Cause Reports and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain what other improvements could be made to the Single-Piece First-Class Mail Root Cause Reports that are not currently planned.

g. Please explain how the Single-Piece First-Class Mail Root Cause Reports can be used to measure the impact of low productivity on automated equipment on flats costs.

h. Please explain how the Single-Piece First-Class Mail Root Cause Reports can be used to measure the impact of low productivity on automated equipment on flats service.

5. Lean Six Sigma and Kaizen studies related to low productivity

a. Please list all Lean Six Sigma and Kaizen studies conducted from FY 2013 to present related to low productivity on automated equipment. *See id.* at 42.

b. Please list all inputs to each Lean Six Sigma and Kaizen study related to low productivity on automated equipment.

c. Please list all uses and/or outputs each Lean Six Sigma and Kaizen study related to low productivity on automated equipment.

d. Please explain results, such as changes in processes that occurred because of any Lean Six Sigma or Kaizen study listed above.

e. Please explain any planned Lean Six Sigma or Kaizen studies and when those studies will take place.

f. Please explain how Lean Six Sigma and Kaizen studies can be used to measure the impact of low productivity on automated equipment on flats costs.

g. Please explain how Lean Six Sigma and Kaizen studies can be used to measure the impact of low productivity on automated equipment on flats service.

Pinch Point 3: Manual Sorting

1. WebEOR and WebMODS and Manual Survey

a. Please confirm that the inputs to WebEOR and WebMODS regarding manual processing are manual survey results and TACS. *See* Response to CIR No. 1 at 56-57. Please list any additional inputs in WebEOR, WebMODS and the Manual Survey related to manual sorting. If not confirmed, please list all inputs to WebEOR and WebMODS and the Manual Survey related to manual sorting.

b. Please confirm that WebEOR and WebMODS determine ratios of manual piece handling from the survey to corresponding automated workloads for each mail shape. *See id.* at 56. Please explain any other capabilities of WebEOR and WebMODS related to manual sorting.

c. Please confirm that WebEOR and WebMODS data are used to approximate the manual TPH processed at each facility on a daily basis in WebMODS and manual sorting productivities. *See id.* at 56-57. Please explain any additional uses and/or outputs of WebEOR and WebMODS related to manual sorting.

d. Please provide quarterly reports from WebEOR and WebMODS for the past 5 years related to manual sorting. At a minimum, the report should include:

i. Manual TPH processed; and

ii. National results from week-long survey of manual unit.

e. Please explain if there are planned improvements to WebEOR and WebMODS related to manual processing and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain if other improvements could be made to WebEOR and WebMODS related to manual processing that are not currently planned and the goals of such improvements.

g. Please explain how WebEOR and WebMODS can be used to measure the impact of manual processing on flats costs.

h. Please explain how WebEOR and WebMODS can be used to measure the impact of manual processing on flats service.

2. eFlash

a. Please confirm that WebEOR counts or manual workloads approximated by quantifying the linear measurement of mail are inputs to eFlash. *See id.* at 57. Please list any additional inputs to eFlash. If not confirmed, please list all inputs to eFlash.

b. Please confirm that eFlash provides estimates of manual incoming secondary distribution volumes. *See id.* Please explain any additional capabilities of eFlash.

c. Please confirm eFlash is used for manual workload counts. *See id.* Please explain any additional uses and/or outputs of eFlash.

d. Please provide national, quarterly eFlash reports from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, the reports should include estimates of manual incoming secondary distribution volumes.

e. Please explain if there are any planned improvements to eFlash and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain if there are other improvements that could be made to eFlash that are not currently planned.

g. Please confirm that the Postal Service plans to use RFID technology as described in its CIR Response. *See id.* at 62-63. If confirmed, please explain when use of RFID will start.

h. Please provide an estimate of how often manual workloads are approximated by linear measurement. Please explain how the estimate was developed.

i. Please confirm that there is a plan to track manual flat distribution workhours at delivery units. *See id.* at 57.

j. Please explain how eFlash can be used to measure the impact of manual processing on flats costs.

k. Please explain how eFlash can be used to measure the impact of manual processing on flats service.

Pinch Point 4: Productivity and Service Issues in Allied Operations

1. Work in Process (WIP) Metrics Provided by the SPD Tool

a. Please confirm that the following data systems are inputs to WIP Metrics: SPD, BIDS, SASP, PostalOne!, and FAST. *See id.* at 70-71. Please list any additional inputs to WIP Metrics. If not confirmed, please list all inputs to the WIP Metrics.

b. Please confirm that the Postal Service primarily leverages the WIP metric to detect possible delays at various stages in mail processing, which can help identify issues that may have an adverse impact on service. *See id.* at 70. Please confirm that SPD uses the information from WIP Metrics to provide reports that help diagnose service issues. *See id.* at 71. If not confirmed, please explain how the Postal Service uses WIP Metrics to identify service issues. Please provide any additional capabilities of the WIP Metrics.

c. Please confirm that the WIP reports provide data at the area, district, and facility level by mail shape and destination entry discount, for a given period of time. *See id.* Please provide any additional uses and/or outputs of WIP Metrics. If not confirmed, please provide all uses and/or outputs of WIP Metrics.

d. Please provide the quarterly WIP Metrics from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, the following aggregated data should be included in the report:

   i. Median hours between a container's actual entry time and the bundle scan; and

   ii. Time elapsed from the container's actual entry time to the initial automation piece level scan.

e. Please explain if there are any planned improvements to WIP Metrics and when those improvements will occur. Please explain what other improvements could be made to WIP Metrics that are not currently planned.

f. Please explain how WIP Metrics can be used to measure the impact of productivity and service issues in allied operations on flats costs.

g. Please explain how WIP Metrics can be used to measure the impact of productivity and service issues in allied operations on flats service.

2. Bundle Visibility Program/Reports

a. Please list all inputs to the Bundle Visibility Program/Reports.

b. Please explain all capabilities of the Bundle Visibility Program/Reports.

c. Please explain all uses and/or outputs of the Bundle Visibility Program/Reports.

d. Please provide national, quarterly Bundle Visibility Program/Reports from FY 2013 to present.

e. Please explain efforts to improve scan compliance to 100 percent. *See id.* at 72.

f. Please explain any planned improvements to the Bundle Visibility Program/Reports and when those improvements will take place.

g. Please explain what other improvements could be made to the Bundle Visibility Program/Reports that are not currently planned.

h. Please explain how the Bundle Visibility Program/Reports can be used to measure the impact of productivity and service Issues in allied operations on flats costs.

i. Please explain how the Bundle Visibility Program/Reports can be used to measure the impact of productivity and service issues in allied operations on flats service.

Pinch Point 5: Increased Transportation Time and Cost

1. Enterprise Transportation Analytics (ETA)

a. Please confirm that ETA inputs are geographic location data generated by handheld scanning devices. *See id.* at 82-83. Please list any additional inputs to ETA. If not confirmed, please list all inputs to ETA.

b. Please confirm that ETA produces data needed to monitor vehicles as they navigate between Postal Service facilities. *See id.* Please explain any additional capabilities of ETA.

c. Please confirm that ETA includes a dashboard that shows current vehicle performance and highlights where current delays exist. *See id.* Please explain any additional uses and/or outputs of ETA.

d. Please provide national, quarterly ETA reports from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, these reports should include:

i. Deviations from planned schedules; and

ii. Vehicle performance.

e. Please explain if there are any other planned improvements to ETA and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain what other improvements could be made to ETA that are not currently planned.

g. Please explain how ETA can be used to measure the impact of transportation on flats costs.

h. Please explain how ETA can be used to measure the impact of transportation on flats service.

2. SVWeb and Transportation Information Management Evaluation System (TIMES)

a. Please confirm that inputs to SVWeb and TIMES come from mobile scanners. *See* 120-Day Response at 58. Please list any additional inputs to SVWeb and TIMES. If not confirmed, please list all inputs to SVWeb and TIMES.

b. Please confirm that TIMES and SVWeb applications allow managers to pull reports presenting area, district, and facility data, such as the number of trips that have arrived and departed over a given period of time, the percentage of the load on each trip (utilization), and the on-time performance for each trip. *See id.* at 61-62. Please explain any additional capabilities of SVWeb and TIMES.

c. Please confirm that SVWeb tracks the usage of transportation resources, identifies opportunities to mitigate costs, and optimizes the surface transportation network. *See id.* at 62. Please explain any additional uses and/or outputs of SVWeb and TIMES.

d. Please provide national, quarterly reports from SVWeb and/or TIMES from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, these reports should include:

i. On-time departure percentage;

ii. On-time arrival percentage;

iii. Space utilization by container type;

iv. Load percentage;

v. Late container scans; and

vi. Missent containers.

e. Please explain if there are any planned improvements to SVWeb and/or TIMES and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain what other improvements could be made to SVWeb and/or TIMES that are not currently planned.

g. Please explain how SVWeb and/or TIMES can be used to measure the impact of transportation on flats costs.

h. Please explain how SVWeb and/or TIMES can be used to measure the impact of transportation on flats service.

3. Bundle Visibility Reports

a. Please confirm that scan data from carrier route bundles at mail processing plants and delivery units are the only inputs to Bundle Visibility Reports. *See* Response to CIR No. 1 at 27. Please list any additional inputs to Bundle Visibility Reports. If not confirmed, please list all inputs to Bundle Visibility Reports.

b. Please confirm that Bundle Visibility Reports show when a carrier route bundle is processed, when it leaves the plant for transportation to the delivery unit, when it arrives at the delivery unit, and when distribution of carrier route bundles is finished. *See* 120-Day Response at 62. Please explain any additional capabilities of Bundle Visibility Reports.

c. Please confirm that Bundle Visibility Reports identify and improve visibility of carrier route bundles by tracking where the bundles are actually located in the mail stream. *See id.* Please explain any additional uses and/or outputs of Bundle Visibility Reports.

d. Please provide national, quarterly Bundle Visibility Reports from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, the following data should be included in the reports:

i. Number of bundles processed;

ii. Number of bundles processed by class;

iii. Flows of carrier route bundles (*see id.*);

iv. Percent of Total Bundle Count (*see* Response to CIR No. 1 at 36); and

v. Identified last mile issues due to transportation (*see* 120-Day Response at 62).

e. Please explain if there are any planned improvements to Bundle Visibility Reports related to transportation and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain what other improvements could be made to Bundle Visibility Reports that are not currently planned.

g. Please explain how the Bundle Visibility Reports can be used to measure the impact of transportation on flats costs.

h. Please explain how the Bundle Visibility Reports can be used to measure the impact of transportation on flats service.

Pinch Point 6: Last Mile Delivery

1. Customer Service Daily Reporting System (CSDRS)

a. Please list all inputs to CSDRS. *See* Response to CIR No. 1 at 85.

b. Please confirm that CSDRS allows Post Offices, stations, and branches to report curtailed (Standard Mail only) and delayed volumes of mail by class and type (by piece) as information and for potential action or intervention by Postmasters or district, area, or headquarters personnel. *See id.* Please explain any additional capabilities of CSDRS.

c. Please confirm that CSDRS data are available at the 5-digit ZIP Code level all the way to a national aggregate, and at various organizational levels. *See id.* Please list any additional uses and/or outputs from CSDRS.

d. Please provide national, quarterly CSDRS reports from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, the reports should include:

i. Mail volumes delayed in the Post Office by carriers;

ii. Mail volumes delayed in the Post Office by clerks;

iii. Mail volumes delayed by late departure and return of carriers

iv. Mail volumes delayed by missent mail (sent to the wrong delivery unit by a mail processing plant);

v. Mail volumes delayed by missorted mail (sorted to an incorrect route with the same destination service area);

vi. Mail volumes delayed by mail arriving late to the delivery unit; and

vii. Mail volumes delayed by mail from a processing plant for which carrier route sortation was expected but not applied.

e. Please explain if there are there any planned improvements to CSDRS and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain if other improvements could be made to CSDRS that are not currently planned.

g. Please explain how CSDRS can be used to measure the impact of last mile delivery on flats costs.

h. Please explain how CSDRS can be used to measure the impact of last mile delivery on flats service.

2. Service Performance Measurement (SPM)

a. Please list all inputs to SPM. *See* Response to CIR No. 1 at 88.

b. Please confirm that SPM is a web-based program that provides local managers near real-time intelligence on last mile delivery from the final processing of automated letters and flats at mail processing facilities to the actual delivery point. *See id.* Please explain any additional capabilities of SPM related to last mile delivery.

c. Please confirm that under SPM, postal clerks and carriers scan randomly selected mailpieces and data from those scans are used to measure

service performance. *See id.* Please explain any additional uses and/or outputs of SPM data.

d. Please provide national, quarterly data for SPM from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, the reports should include:

   i. Last mile impacts by process flow;

   ii. Last mile impacts by product type;

   iii. Last mile impacts by delivery unit; and

   iv. Last mile impacts by transportation flow.

e. Please explain if there are there any planned improvements to SPM and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain what other improvements could be made to SPM that are not currently planned.

g. Please explain how SPM can be used to measure the impact of last mile delivery on flats costs.

h. Please explain how SPM can be used to measure the impact of last mile delivery on flats service.

3. Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard

a. Please confirm that IMb Service Performance Diagnostics System is the only input to the Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard. *See id.* at 91. Please list any additional inputs to the Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard. If not confirmed, please list all inputs to the Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard.

b. Please confirm that the Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard is a process for indicating when mailer-prepared carrier route bundles arrive at a delivery unit, are processed, and delivered. *See id.* Please explain any additional capabilities of the Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard.

c. Please confirm that the Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard displays key data elements on scanning compliance; expected versus actual bundle scans, the number and percent of bundles sent out for delivery and those curtailed in the unit. *See id.* at 92. Please explain any additional uses and/or outputs of the Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard.

d. Please provide national, quarterly Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecards from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, the following data should be included in the reports:

i. Percentage for Delivery Unit (DU) Bundles Visibility Scores;

ii. Percentage for Distributed Scan Compliance;

iii. Percentage for Out For Delivery (OFD) Bundles;

iv. Percentage for Inventory Complete Scan Compliance; and

v. Number of curtailed bundles.

e. Please explain if there are any planned improvements to the Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain what other improvements could be made to the Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard that are not currently planned.

g. Please explain how the Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard can be used to measure the impact of last mile delivery on flats costs.

h. Please explain how the Bundle Scanning Visibility Scorecard can be used to measure the impact of last mile delivery on flats service.

4. Transit-Time Measurement System (TTMS)

a. Please confirm that External First-Class (EXFC) measurement and Intelligent Mail Accuracy and Performance System (IMAPS) service performance measurement systems are inputs to TTMS. *See id.* at 93. Please list any additional inputs to TTMS. If not confirmed, please list all inputs to TTMS.

b. Please confirm that TTMS calculates the last mile impact for flats. *See id.* Please explain any additional capabilities of TTMS.

c. Please confirm that TTMS generates weekly reports that provide information at the destination district level for Presort First-Class Mail flats by service standard, for Standard Mail and Periodicals flats by destination entry type and service standard group, and Bound Printed Matter flats by destination entry type. *See id.* Please explain any additional uses and/or outputs of TTMS.

d. Please provide national, quarterly TTMS data from FY 2013 to present. At a minimum, the following data should be reported:

   i. Rate of last mile delays by destination entry type; and

   ii. Rate of last mile delays by service standard group.

e. Please explain if there are any planned improvements to TTMS and when those improvements will occur.

f. Please explain if there are any other improvements could be made to TTMS that are not currently planned.

g. Please explain how TTMS can be used to measure the impact of last mile delivery on flats costs.

h. Please explain how TTMS can be used to measure the impact of last mile delivery on flats service.

Other data:

1. Please provide national, quarterly data from FY 2013 to the present that combines all flats products to look at volume changes, unit cost changes, unit cost component changes, etc. Please provide any available insight as to reasons for those changes.

2. Please provide a description of ideas generated by industry leaders that are designed to measure cost and service performance, track key metrics, and meet service performance targets for flats.

3. Please provide a narrative that explains IV's capability to measure costs and provide a timeline for implementation of those capabilities.

4. Please provide Flats Sequencing System (FSS) analysis that shows how FSS has impacted each of the pinch points.

5. Please explain the "Proof of Concept" for tracking newspapers that go through manual mail flow. *See id.* at 58.

6. Please explain when the Postal Service will define the expected mail flow path for each type of flats product, based on the mail class, service standard, sortation level, entry point and day of entry, and destination. *See id.* at 59.

By the Commission.

Stacy L. Ruble
Secretary